DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 469 767 TM 034 530

AUTHOR	Speicher, Nancy
TITLE	School Locale Codes, 1987-2000. Working Paper Series.
INSTITUTION	National Center for Education Statistics (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	NCES-WP-2002-02
PUB DATE	2002-02-00
NOTE	49p.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics, 1990 K Street NW, Room 9048, Washington, DC 20006. For full text: htpp://www.nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Coding; *Data Analysis; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Geographic Regions; *Public Schools; *Schools; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	Common Core of Data Program; *Locale Definitions

ABSTRACT

A school locale code defines show a school is situated in a particular location in terms of the size of the community in which it is located and the proximity of that community to urban and metropolitan areas. School locale codes are part of the general information reported by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in the Common Core of Data (CCD) Public School Universe file. This paper includes information on the history of locale codes; the definitions of codes and how they have changed since the original codes were developed; the original methodology for assigning school locale codes, metro status codes, and district-level locale codes; and the changes that have taken place in the methodologies. It is intended as a resource for those who use local code statistics from multiple years of the NCES CCD files. Locale codes were first used in the school year 1987-1988 data collection, but their definitions have changed over the years, and will continue to change as the need arises. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

TM

ED 469 767

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

Working Paper Series

School Locale Codes 1987 – 2000

Working Paper No. 2002–02 February 2002

Contact: Frank Johnson
Elementary/Secondary and Libraries Studies Division
E-mail: frank.johnson@ed.gov

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TM034530

U. S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

Working Paper Series

The Working Paper Series was initiated to promote the sharing of the valuable work experience and knowledge reflected in these preliminary reports. These reports are viewed as works in progress, and have not undergone a rigorous review for consistency with NCES Statistical Standards prior to inclusion in the Working Paper Series.

U. S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement

U.S. Department of Education
Rod Paige
Secretary

Office of Educational Research and Improvement
Grover J. Whitehurst
Assistant Secretary

National Center for Education Statistics
Gary W. Phillips
Deputy Commissioner

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is the primary federal entity for collecting, analyzing, and reporting data related to education in the United States and other nations. It fulfills a congressional mandate to collect, collate, analyze, and report full and complete statistics on the condition of education in the United States; conduct and publish reports and specialized analyses of the meaning and significance of such statistics; assist state and local education agencies in improving their statistical systems; and review and report on education activities in foreign countries.

NCES activities are designed to address high priority education data needs; provide consistent, reliable, complete, and accurate indicators of education status and trends; and report timely, useful, and high quality data to the U.S. Department of Education, the Congress, the states, other education policymakers, practitioners, data users, and the general public.

We strive to make our products available in a variety of formats and in language that is appropriate to a variety of audiences. You, as our customer, are the best judge of our success in communicating information effectively. If you have any comments or suggestions about this or any other NCES product or report, we would like to hear from you. Please direct your comments to:

National Center for Education Statistics
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U.S. Department of Education
1990 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20006

February 2002

The NCES World Wide Web Home Page is
http://nces.ed.gov

Suggested Citation

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *School Locale Codes 1987 – 2000,* NCES 2002-02, by Nancy Speicher. Arnold A. Goldstein, project officer. Washington, DC: 2002.

Foreword

In addition to official NCES publications, NCES staff and individuals commissioned by NCES produce preliminary research reports that include analyses of survey results, and presentations of technical, methodological, and statistical evaluation issues.

The ***Working Paper Series*** was initiated to promote the sharing of the valuable work experience and knowledge reflected in these preliminary reports. These reports are viewed as works in progress, and have not undergone a rigorous review for consistency with NCES Statistical Standards prior to inclusion in the Working Paper Series.

Copies of Working Papers can be downloaded as pdf files from the NCES Electronic Catalog (http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/), or contact Sheilah Jupiter at (202) 502–7444, e-mail: sheilah_jupiter@ed.gov, or mail: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics, 1990 K Street NW, Room 9048, Washington, DC 20006.

Marilyn M. Seastrom
Chief Mathematical Statistician
Statistical Standards Program

Ralph Lee
Mathematical Statistician
Statistical Standards Program

School Locale Codes 1987 - 2000

Prepared by:

Nancy Speicher

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
National Center for Education Statistics

February 2002

School Locale Codes 1987-2000

Introduction

A school locale code defines how a school is situated in a particular location in terms of the size of the community in which it is located and the proximity of that community to urban and metropolitan areas. School locale codes are part of the general information reported by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in the Common Core of Data (CCD) Public School Universe file.[1] Other information in the file includes school names, addresses, and telephone numbers; types of schools; and operational status codes (e.g., new or closed). In addition to this general directory information, the database contains student and staffing information.

This paper includes information on the history of locale codes, the definitions of the codes and how they have changed since the original codes were developed, the original methodology for assigning school locale codes, metro status codes, and district-level locale codes, and the changes that have taken place in the methodologies. It is intended as a resource for those who use locale code statistics from multiple years of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) files.

The mutually exclusive school locale designations, developed to assign an urbanicity measure to schools used extensively for analysis and sampling purposes, were first used during the school year (SY) 1987–88 data collection.[2] Locale codes were assigned on the basis of U.S. Bureau of the Census data defining geographical places, listing their populations and population densities, coding them with respect to Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs), and designating them as rural or urbanized. Since then, there have been refinements to both the locale codes and the processes by which they are assigned in order to improve designations.

---

[1] The CCD Public School Universe Survey is an annual collection containing basic demographic information on every public school in the United States. Information is sent to NCES by state education agencies from their administrative records.

[2] The original development and assignment of school locale codes are described in, F. Johnson, *Assigning Type of Locale Codes to the 1987-88 CCD Public School Universe*, CES 89-194, U.S. Department of Education, 1989.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

History of Geographic Urbanicity Codes

Three major classification systems are used by federal agencies to classify the urbanicity of geographic or governmental units: Beale codes, metro status codes, and locale codes. Beale codes, officially known as ERS County Typology Codes, are calculated by examining the size of a county and its proximity to a metropolitan area. Developed by Dr. Calvin Beale for the Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service (ERS) in the early 1970s, Beale codes are assigned to all schools in a school district based on the county in which the superintendent's mailing address is located. The 10 categories are:

0. Central counties of metropolitan areas with a population of 1 million or more
1. Fringe counties of metropolitan areas with a population of 1 million or more
2. Counties in metropolitan areas with a population of 250,000 to 1 million
3. Counties in metropolitan areas with a population of less than 250,000
4. Urban population of 20,000 or more, adjacent to a metropolitan area
5. Urban population of 20,000 or more, not adjacent to a metropolitan area
6. Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metropolitan area
7. Urban population of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metropolitan area
8. Completely rural with no places with a population of 2,500 or more, adjacent to a metropolitan area
9. Completely rural with no places with a population of 2,500 or more, not adjacent to a metropolitan area

Categories 0 to 3 are considered metropolitan counties, while 4 through 9 are nonmetropolitan counties. Beale codes have been used by a number of agencies, including the Department of Education,[3] but their usefulness is limited because in assigning one code to all schools in a district, it is impossible to account for districts whose boundaries cross county lines. This problem is compounded by the existence of districts for which the superintendent's address is a post office box or other postal system that is not the same as the actual physical location of the district.

---

[3] For example, see N. Khattri, K. Riley, and M. Kane, Students at risk in poor, rural areas: A review of the research. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 13, no. 2 (1997): 79-100.

Metro status codes make up a simple system of three codes based on the location of the school district. These codes are part of the information on the CCD Local Education Agency (School District) Universe file. In this system, too, there is no way to deal with a district that crosses county boundaries or uses a central postal system. In addition, there is no category for a district that is outside a Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA) or Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) but is not rural. The codes are:

1. Central city of a CMSA or MSA
2. Located in a CMSA or MSA, but not in the central city
3. Not located in a CMSA or MSA

Beginning with SY 1999–2000, the CCD assigns metro status codes that are based on locale codes. The methodology used to assign metro status codes is presented in detail later in this paper.

The locale codes, or Johnson codes as they are sometimes known, address some of the problems with the Beale and metro status codes. Based on proximity to metropolitan areas as well as population size and density, locale codes were first assigned to individual schools in the 50 states and the District of Columbia in the 1987-88 school year. Adequate information is not available to classify schools in territories or other outlying areas. The original codes were assigned based on the school mailing address, which does not necessarily indicate the geographic location of the school, such as when the mailing address is a post office box in a nearby town, or the school uses a district office address for mail. Beginning in SY 1998–99, the physical location of the school was used whenever the physical location address had been reported by the state. The use of location address rather than mailing address makes the locale codes more valuable and eliminates one source of inconsistency between CCD and commercial school mailing lists such as Quality Education Data (QED) and Market Data Retrieval (MDR). Information about the number of schools for which changes occurred in locale code based on use of location address is presented later in this paper.

Definitions of Locale Codes

Since the original assignment of codes, there have been changes in the definitions and the files used in the assignment process, and growth in the urban areas and MSAs. The definitions and when they were instituted are shown in table 1. The shaded areas indicate changes from previous definitions.

Table 1.—Locale code definitions: School year 1987-88 to 1998-99

Code	1987–88 to 1993–94	1994–95 to 1997–98	Beginning in 1998–99
1-Large City	Central city of a metropolitan statistical area (MSA) with population of at least 400,000 or a population density of at least 6,000 people per square mile.	Central city of a metropolitan statistical area (MSA) or consolidated MSA (CMSA); with a population of at least 250,000.	Central city of a metropolitan statistical area (MSA) or consolidated MSA (CMSA); with a population of at least 250,000.
2-Mid-size city	Central city of an MSA with a population less than 400,000 and a population density of less than 6,000 people per square mile.	Central city of an MSA or CMSA; with a population of less than 250,000.	Central city of an MSA or CMSA; with a population less than 250,000.
3-Urban fringe of a large city	Place within an MSA of a large city and defined as urban by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.	Any incorporated place, Census designated place (CDP), or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a large city and defined as urban by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.	Any incorporated place, Census-designated place (CDP), or non-place territory within a CMSA or MSA of a large city and defined as urban by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.
4-Urban fringe of a mid-size city	Place within an MSA of a midsize central city and defined as urban by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.	Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place within a CMSA or MSA of a midsize central city and defined as urban by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.	Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place within a CMSA or MSA of a midsize central city and defined as urban by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.
5-Large town	Town not within an MSA with a population of at least 25,000.	An incorporated place or CDP with a population of at least 25,000 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.	An incorporated place or CDP with a population of at least 25,000 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
6-Small town	Town not within an MSA with a population between 2,500 and 24,999.	An incorporated place or CDP with a population between 2,500 and 24,999 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.	An incorporated place or CDP with a population between 2,500 and 24,999 and located outside a CMSA or MSA.
7-Rural Beginning in 1998–99: Rural, outside MSA	Place with fewer than 2,500 people and coded as rural by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.	Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory designated as rural by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.	Any incorporated place, CDP, or non-place territory designated as rural by the U.S. Bureau of the Census; excludes places that are within an MSA.
8-Rural, inside MSA			Any place meeting the definition of rural that is within an MSA.

Note: Shading indicates change from previous definition.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The following summarizes the major changes shown in table 1:

- Beginning in SY 1994–95, the threshold size of a large city was lowered from 400,000 to 250,000, and the population density requirement was dropped. This was done at the recommendation of the Geography Division, Bureau of the Census, which assumed responsibility for assigning the codes at that time.

- Beginning in SY 1998–99, codes were assigned on the basis of the physical location of the school for the 17 states that provided this information. If mailing address was the school's physical location, states did not report a separate location address. Mailing address remained the default if no location address was reported.

- In SY 1998–99, the rural category was divided into rural, outside a metropolitan area, and rural, inside a metropolitan area. This new code was added in response to users who wanted to identify all schools located in metropolitan areas, including those that fell into the rural category. About 7 percent of the schools were given the new code.

Table 2 shows the percentage of schools by level of urbanicity for each school year from 1987–88 to 1999–2000.

Table 2.—Percentage of schools by level of urbanicity (locale code): School year 1987–88 to 1999–2000

	1987–88	1988–89	1989–90	1990–91	1991–92	1992–93	1993–94	1994–95	1995–96	1996–97	1997–98	1998–99	1999–2000
1–Large city	9.0	9.1	9.1	13.1	9.6	9.3	9.4	12.4	12.5	12.7	12.9	11.9	12.2
2–Mid-size city	14.3	14.3	14.1	13.5	14.5	14.5	14.5	14.9	14.5	14.5	14.6	12.3	12.4
3–Urban fringe of a large city	13.5	13.6	14.2	13.6	14.6	14.3	14.5	21.9	24.2	24.3	24.3	22.9	23.6
4–Urban fringe of a mid-sized city	9.8	9.9	9.8	9.1	9.9	9.7	9.6	7.8	8.9	8.9	8.8	7.9	8.5
5–Large town	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.9	2.7	2.6	2.6	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.3	1.3
6–Small town	23.6	23.4	23.0	21.1	22.2	22.5	22.6	14.3	13.1	13.0	13.0	12.7	11.7
7–Rural	27.4	27.4	27.6	24.8	26.5	27.1	26.7	26.5	25.1	24.9	24.6	23.0	19.2
8–Rural, urban fringe	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	7.8	11.1

Note: Percents may not sum to 100 because of rounding.

† Not applicable; this category did not exist until 1998–99.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey," 1987-88 to 1999-2000.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3 shows the number and percentage of schools and the number and percentage of students by level of urbanicity for each year locale codes were assigned..

Table 3.—Number and percentage of schools students by level of urbanicity (locale code): School year 1987–88 to 1999–2000

Locale code	Number of schools	Percent of schools	Number of students	Percent of students
1987-88:				
U.S. total	82,665	100.0	39,914,335	100.0
1 - Large city	7,463	9.0	5,347,256	13.4
2 - Mid-size city	11,841	14.3	6,733,324	16.9
3 - Urban fringe of a large city	11,178	13.5	6,702,726	16.8
4 - Urban fringe of a mid-size city	8,124	9.8	4,802,864	12.0
5 - Large town	1,921	2.3	977,782	2.4
6 - Small town	19,464	23.5	8,810,507	22.1
7 - Rural	22,674	27.4	6,539,876	16.4
1988-89:				
U. S. total	82,607	100.0	40,440,237	100.0
1 - Large city	7,506	9.1	5,449,071	13.5
2 - Mid-size city	11,836	14.3	6,880,365	17.0
3 - Urban fringe of a large city	11,261	13.6	6,781,750	16.8
4 - Urban fringe of a mid-size city	8,140	9.9	4,863,873	12.0
5 - Large town	1,884	2.3	974,027	2.4
6 - Small town	19,360	23.4	8,876,594	21.9
7 - Rural	22,620	27.4	6,614,557	16.4
1989-90:				
U. S. total	82,595	100.0	40,528,362	100.0
1 - Large city	7,525	9.1	5,377,942	13.3
2 - Mid-size city	11,656	14.1	6,782,982	16.7
3 - Urban fringe of a large city	11,716	14.2	7,040,546	17.4
4 - Urban fringe of a mid-size city	8,079	9.8	4,838,942	11.9
5 - Large town	1,836	2.2	956,579	2.4
6 - Small town	18,995	23.0	8,831,952	21.8
7 - Rural	22,788	27.6	6,699,419	16.5
1990-91:				
U. S. total	82,926	100.0	41,167,444	100.0
1 - Large city	11,101	13.1	7,147,708	17.1
2 - Mid-size city	11,380	13.5	6,795,510	16.3
3 - Urban fringe of a large city	11,500	13.6	6,999,141	16.7
4 - Urban fringe of a mid-size city	7,664	9.1	4,527,543	10.8
5 - Large town	2,481	2.9	1,082,078	2.6
6 - Small town	17,834	21.1	8,392,690	20.1
7 - Rural	20,966	24.8	6,222,774	14.9

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey," 1987-88 to 1999-2000.

Table 3.—Number and percentage of schools and students by level of urbanicity (locale code): School year 1987–88 to 1999–2000-continued

Locale code	Number of schools	Percent of schools	Number of students	Percent of students
1991–92:				
U. S. total	83,530	100.0	41,948,703	100.0
1 - Large city	8,015	9.6	5,630,337	13.4
2 - Mid-size city	12,146	14.5	7,190,427	17.1
3 - Urban fringe of a large city	12,170	14.6	7,394,087	17.6
4 - Urban fringe of a mid-size city	8,240	9.9	4,885,614	11.6
5 - Large town	2,285	2.7	1,141,091	2.7
6 - Small town	18,577	22.2	8,835,112	21.1
7 - Rural	22,097	26.5	6,872,035	16.4
1992–93:				
U. S. total	84,326	100.0	42,640,889	100.0
1 - Large city	7,865	9.3	5,646,156	13.2
2 - Mid-size city	12,216	14.5	7,323,357	17.2
3 - Urban fringe of a large city	12,038	14.3	7,502,184	17.6
4 - Urban fringe of a mid-size city	8,171	9.7	4,964,726	11.6
5 - Large town	2,208	2.6	1,139,094	2.7
6 - Small town	19,001	22.5	9,023,919	21.2
7 - Rural	22,827	27.1	7,041,453	16.5
1993–94:				
U. S. total	85,379	100.0	43,278,061	100.0
1 - Large city	8,048	9.4	5,719,904	13.2
2 - Mid-size city	12,358	14.5	7,426,817	17.2
3 - Urban fringe of a large city	12,390	14.5	7,652,904	17.7
4 - Urban fringe of a mid-size city	8,230	9.6	5,023,184	11.6
5 - Large town	2,219	2.6	1,154,181	2.7
6 - Small town	19,312	22.6	9,161,088	21.2
7 - Rural	22,822	26.7	7,139,983	16.5
1994–95:				
U. S. total	86,211	100.0	44,031,399	100.0
1 - Large city	10,932	12.4	7,628,824	17.3
2 - Mid-size city	12,886	14.9	7,538,027	17.1
3 - Urban fringe of a large city	18,864	21.9	11,798,927	26.8
4 - Urban fringe of a mid-size city	6,698	7.8	3,868,066	8.8
5 - Large town	1,598	1.9	823,785	1.9
6 - Small town	12,356	14.3	5,497,832	12.5
7 - Rural	22,877	26.5	6,875,938	15.6

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey," 1987-88 to 1999-2000.

Table 3.—Number and percentage of schools and students by level of urbanicity (locale code): School year 1987–88 to 1999–2000-continued

Locale code	Number of schools	Percent of schools	Number of students	Percent of students
1995–96:				
U. S. total	87,108	100.0	44,684,213	100.0
1 - Large city	10,921	12.5	7,702,294	17.2
2 - Mid-size city	12,611	14.5	7,286,261	16.3
3 - Urban fringe of a large city	21,086	24.2	13,158,735	29.4
4 - Urban fringe of a mid-size city	7,773	8.9	4,319,974	9.7
5 - Large town	1,491	1.7	749,879	1.7
6 - Small town	11,389	13.1	4,985,742	11.2
7 - Rural	21,837	25.1	6,481,328	14.5
1996–97:				
U. S. total	88,136	100.0	44,167,410	100.0
1 - Large city	11,162	12.7	7,802,363	17.7
2 - Mid-size city	12,769	14.5	7,254,863	16.4
3 - Urban fringe of a large city	21,438	24.3	12,512,161	28.3
4 - Urban fringe of a mid-size city	7,851	8.9	4,378,588	9.9
5 - Large town	1,516	1.7	751,400	1.7
6 - Small town	11,493	13.0	4,991,706	11.3
7 - Rural	21,907	24.9	6,476,329	14.7
1997–98:				
U. S. total	89,378	100.0	46,012,123	100.0
1 - Large city	11,516	12.9	8,049,149	17.5
2 - Mid-size city	13,064	14.6	7,450,766	16.2
3 - Urban fringe of a large city	21,742	24.3	13,754,458	29.9
4 - Urban fringe of a mid-size city	7,897	8.8	4,405,126	9.6
5 - Large town	1,528	1.7	746,458	1.6
6 - Small town	11,621	13.0	5,012,169	10.9
7 - Rural	22,010	24.6	6,593,997	14.3
1998–99				
U. S. total	90,320	100.0	46,387,169	100.0
1 - Large city	10,785	11.9	7,384,739	15.9
2 - Mid-size city	11,100	12.3	6,278,220	13.5
3 - Urban fringe of a large city	20,679	22.9	13,188,863	28.4
4 - Urban fringe of a mid-size city	7,173	7.9	4,157,930	9.0
5 - Large town	1,199	1.3	583,098	1.3
6 - Small town	11,493	12.7	4,939,478	10.6
7 - Rural, outside MSA	20,815	23.0	6,127,721	13.2
8 - Rural, inside MSA	7,076	7.8	3,727,120	8.0

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey," 1987-88 to 1999-2000.

Table 3.—Number and percentage of schools and students by level of urbanicity (locale code): School year 1987–88 to 1999–2000-continued

Locale code	Number of schools	Percent of schools	Number of students	Percent of students
1999–2000				
U. S. total*	91,040	100.0	46,689,373	100.0
1 - Large city	11,085	12.2	7,455,108	16.0
2 - Mid-size city	11,265	12.4	6,285,008	13.5
3 - Urban fringe of a large city	21,466	23.6	13,848,063	29.7
4 - Urban fringe of a mid-size city	7,747	8.5	4,348,194	9.3
5 - Large town	1,193	1.3	572,388	1.2
6 - Small town	10,695	11.7	4,529,501	9.7
7 - Rural, outside MSA	17,463	19.2	4,651,035	10.0
8 - Rural, inside MSA	10,120	11.1	4,999,496	10.7
N - Not applicable	6	0.0	580	0.0

*Includes 6 schools with missing locale codes.

Note: Percents may not sum to 100 because of rounding.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey," 1987-88 to 1999-2000.

School Locale Code Methodology

Different organizations have been responsible for assigning school locale codes. Until the SY 1991–92 collection, NCES staff was responsible for this procedure. In SY 1991–92, Pinkerton Computer Consultants Inc. entered into a contractual agreement with NCES to assign the codes. Beginning with the SY 1994–95 CCD data collection, the Governments Division of the Bureau of the Census assumed the task of assigning locale codes based on information provided by the Geography Division. The steps and files used by these different groups also changed. The sections below describe in detail the processes used to assign school locale codes for given periods of time.

1987 to 1994

Beginning with SY 1987–88, Census files and the CCD School Universe file were merged. Schools from outlying territories were eliminated from the School Universe file before processing began since there was not adequate information available for assignment of locale codes in those locations. These schools were given a code of N for "not applicable."

Data elements from three Census data files were used:

- 1983 County City Data Book (Place)
  Census place name, state, population, population density

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Geographic Identification Code Scheme for 1983 (GIC)
  Census place name, state, size code, SMSA code

- Census of Population and Housing Zip Code Equivalency File for 1983 (MARF5)
  Census place name, State, ZIP Code, urban/rural designation

Three additional files were used in assigning the school locale codes:

- 1985 OMB Listing of Central Cities of SMSAs
  Used to identify central cities of SMSAs. This file contained more SMSAs than the 1983 GIC file.

- The U.S. Postal Service 1987 National Five-digit ZIP Code and Post Office Directory
  Used to determine schools with city names in the address, but with ZIP Codes identifying them as being outside the city limits.

- NCES Large Central City Listing (created by NCES)
  Contained city name, SMSA code and state code. Table 4 shows the 52 cities that were selected for this file. All had populations greater than or equal to 400,000 or population densities greater than or equal to 6,000 people per square mile.

Table 4. — Large central cities in NCES listing: 1987-88 locale codes

Atlanta, GA	Houston, TX	Paterson, NJ
Baltimore, MD	Indianapolis, IN	Philadelphia, PA
Berkeley, CA	Jacksonville, FL	Phoenix, AZ
Boston, MA	Jersey City, NJ	Pittsburgh, PA
Bridgeport, CT	Kansas City, MO	Providence, RI
Buffalo, NY	Long Beach, CA	Rochester, NY
Chicago, IL	Los Angeles, CA	Saint Louis, MO
Cleveland, OH	Memphis, TN	San Antonio, TX
Columbus, OH	Miami, FL	San Diego, CA
Dallas, TX	Milwaukee, WI	San Francisco, CA
Denver, CO	Minneapolis, MN	San Jose, CA
Detroit, MI	Nashville, TN	Santa Ana, CA
El Paso, TX	New Haven, CT	Seattle, WA
Elizabeth, NJ	New Orleans, LA	Syracuse, NY
Fort Lauderdale, FL	New York City, NY	Washington, DC
Fort Worth, TX	Newark, NJ	Yonkers, NY
Hartford, CT	Oakland, CA	
Hialeah, FL	Oklahoma City, OK	

The following specific steps were taken to assign locale codes in years 1987-88 through 1991-92:

1. Place and city names in the School Universe file and the three Census files were modified when necessary to attain a common spelling and abbreviation convention so files could be merged using city in the mailing address field. In addition to spelling and abbreviations, other problematic items were accepted local definitions of place, mailing address designations, and Census-recognized boundaries. Place names had different meanings for different organizations and agencies. Census only recognized political entities as places. For the U.S. Postal Service, places were post offices that distributed mail. The boundaries for these mail distribution places did not necessarily conform to the boundaries of cities, counties or other jurisdictions.

2. The School Universe file was merged first with the MARF5 ZIP Code file, matching on ZIP Code fields. (Ninety-three percent matched to this file.) Matches were then merged on the city name from the school address in the School Universe file. If unmatched, the files were merged using place name from the MARF5 ZIP Code file.

3. After the School Universe file was merged with the MARF5 file, it was matched and merged with the GIC file. Forty-seven percent of schools on the School Universe file were matched to the GIC file.

4. Unmatched schools from the match with the GIC were matched and merged with the Place file. Fifty percent of the unmatched schools matched to the Place file.

5. The remaining schools were coded 6 (small town) or 7 (rural) depending on the urban/rural code found on the MARF5 file.

6. Schools in cities that matched both the GIC file and the large central city listing created by NCES were coded 1 (large city).

7. Schools in cities matched to both the GIC file and the OMB listing of central cities, and not matched to the large central city listing were coded 2 (mid-size city).

8. Schools in cities matched to the GIC file, not matched to the OMB listing of central cities and found to have the same SMSA code as cities coded as 1 (large city) were coded 3 (urban fringe of large city).

9. Schools in cities matched to the GIC file and not found on the OMB listing of central cities nor having the same SMSA code as cities on the large central city listing were coded as 4 (urban fringe of mid-size central city).

10. Schools in places not matched to the GIC file, but found on the Place file to have a population greater than or equal to 25,000 were coded as 5 (large town).

11. Schools in places not matched to the GIC file, but were either 1) found on the Place file to have a population greater than or equal to 2,500 and less than 25,000, or 2) not matched to the Place file, but found to be urban on the MARF5 file, were coded as 6 (small town).

12. Schools in places not matched on the GIC file and that were 1) found on the Place file to have a population less than 2,500; 2) not matched to the Place file and found on the MARF5 file to have a rural code; or 3) not matched to any file at all were coded as 7 (rural).

There were three exceptions to these steps:

1. Schools that could not be matched to any file were coded as 7.

2. Places matched to the ZIP Code file indicating urban, but unmatched to either the GIC or Place files were coded as 6.

3. Schools in places matched to the ZIP Code file indicating rural, matched to the Place file indicating a population greater than 2,500 inhabitants, and unmatched to the GIC file, were coded 5 or 6 depending on data in the Place file.

The entire file was checked and adjustments were made after the initial locale code assignment procedure was completed. These adjustments included:

1. Schools matched to the ZIP Code file and coded rural by Census were coded in the following manner:

    - If there was a match to the OMB central city file, then the locale was coded 1 or 2;

    - If there was a match to the GIC file and the city had an SMSA code, but matched to neither the large city file nor the OMB central city file, then the locale was coded 7.

2. The file was checked to make sure that schools assigned 1 or 2 were actually located in the city and not outside and merely using the city name in the address. This was done by matching the ZIP Code with a file of branch post office ZIP Codes created from the U.S. Postal Service's Post Office Directory. The file was then checked to ensure that all schools with the same ZIP code received the same locale code. Locale codes for these schools were changed to the lowest (most urban) code assigned to that ZIP Code.

3. The file was checked to ensure that if more than four schools within a school district were coded as being in an SMSA, then all schools within that district would be coded as being in an SMSA. This was done because most school districts lie within county boundaries and SMSA boundaries follow county lines. It was also necessary because many of schools in small communities within SMSAs used names in addresses not recognized by Census.

Special situations that were described when locale codes were developed are as follows:

- Within a state, it was possible to have schools in the urban fringe of a large city without having any schools in a large city. This occurred when the large city was across the state border, and the surrounding SMSA (urban fringe) encompassed both states.

- If a single SMSA contained two central cities, one designated as a large city and the other a mid-size city, all schools in urban areas within the SMSA (excluding the central cities) were coded as urban fringe of a large city.

Once a school was assigned a locale code, it was not run through the various steps again. Until SY 1997–98, state CCD coordinators were able to change locale codes assigned by NCES to any other code. New schools that were added to the School Universe file were run through the steps of the program until SY 1991–92, when the programming files that had been used for assignment of school locale codes were no longer available. From SY 1991–92 through SY 1993–94, codes for new schools were done manually using a road atlas and the Census' *County and City Data Book 1983*. Whenever possible, a neighboring school was used to determine the locale code.

1994 to 1998

In 1994, the Geography Division (GEO) of the Bureau of the Census was asked to geocode the census block level of the schools (82,204) in the School Universe file. A number of changes occurred in 1994. An eighth category, Non-MA Other Urban was added, although ultimately it was not used in the CCD locale file. Also, the distinction between large and mid-size cities was modified. Metropolitan area classifications were changed, and the terms CMSA and MSA were added, which necessitated the changes to the locale code categories. The new category was used for schools located in places of less than 2,500 inhabitants or in non-place territory located in non-metropolitan urban areas (UAs).

The original locale code definitions did not take into account the UA concept used by the Census Bureau, although use of the MARF5 Zip Code file allowed for the identification of rural areas, or non-UAs. Without the eighth category, some schools located in non-metropolitan UA territory, and therefore classified as urban, would be designated rural. After the codes were assigned, NCES asked GEO to recommend an alternative category for non-MA other urban because of the small number of schools that were assigned that code. In response, GEO reviewed the schools assigned this code and recommended that they be assigned to small town, code 6. The justification for this was that although the places assigned to the new locale code had populations less than 2,500, the Census Bureau classified them as urban because they were in a UA.

In addition, the population threshold for large city and mid-size city was lowered from 400,000 to 250,000 and the population density criteria were eliminated. As a result, Census felt that the

revisions properly excluded from the large city category cities such as State College, PA previously included on the basis of population density, and included cities such as Cincinnati, OH, previously excluded on the basis of population size.

In 1994, GEO prepared two files for the Governments Division of Census as part of its NCES School Locale Code Assignment project. One file had codes assigned using the old definitions but included the added eighth definition. The second file had codes assigned using only the modified definitions. The locale codes on the second file were made available on the CCD file, and the new locale code was not used. SY 1994–95 also was the first year that school locale codes were assigned using 1990 Census data.

1998 to 1999 and later

Beginning in SY 1998–99, school address based on physical location was added to the CCD. The addition of the school location address facilitated the beginning of a more accurate locale code assignment. In March 2000, NCES asked Census to geo-code all of the SY 1998–99 school addresses (physical location) and assign the locale code to those schools. This procedure allowed coding of the school to a block level using TIGER® (Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing), a system and digital database developed by Census to support mapping needs for the decennial census and other Census programs. The TIGER files consist of digital data describing geographic features, rather than graphic images of maps.[4] A School/Agency TIGER file was created to help users link names of public education agencies with NCES identification numbers on the Census TIGER files. The file contains the NCES ID from the CCD followed by the agency name.[5]

Two steps were required before it could be determined which schools could be coded using the new methodology. First, the CCD file was checked for the presence of location addresses. If the location address was missing, the mailing address was used instead. Then addresses were extracted and run through a program to match them to Census TIGER files. An address that could be matched to a Census block — a precise and limited area — could be coded with 100 percent accuracy using the new methodology. County name and/or county FIPS codes were used to resolve discrepancies in address information. It is important to note that while Census block

---

[4] See http://www.census.gov/geo/www/tiger/overview.html for more information on TIGER files.

[5] See http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/agtiger.html.

assignments do not change much between decades, the Census Address Reference files and matching software do change. This can result in a school with the same address for two consecutive years having two different locale codes.

Those addresses (approximately one-third in SY 1998–99) that could not be coded to Census block level were coded using Census "place," a less precise designation. Census also used an urban/rural indicator to assign codes in both the old and new methodologies. This indicator is more precise in the new methodology.

A new school locale code of 8 (rural, inside an MSA) was added in SY 1998–99. This necessitated a change in the definition of code 7. Prior to that year, all schools that met the category of rural had been coded as 7. After the addition of the new code, the definition of 7 was changed to rural, outside an MSA.

The new methodology was applied in the following steps:

1. Each address was checked for an incorporated place code. If this code existed, the address was matched to a list of central cities of metropolitan areas. Addresses that matched this list were determined to be situated in, and therefore assumed to serve primarily, a central city of a metropolitan area. The 1990 Census population of the city was then used to determine whether the school was assigned a locale code of 1 (large central city, population at least 250,000) or 2 (mid-size central city, population less than 250,000).

2. The remaining addresses were checked to determine if they were situated in a metropolitan area. Those schools that were in a metropolitan area were then checked for urban/rural character. Schools that were determined to be rural were assigned a locale code of 8 (rural, inside an MSA). The others were then assigned a locale code of 3 or 4 depending upon the population of the central city of the metropolitan area in which they were situated.

3. All schools that were not classified in either step 1 or step 2 were checked for an incorporated place code. Schools that were situated within an incorporated place were then matched to the population of that place. Schools located in cities with a

population of 25,000 or greater were assigned a code of 5 (large town). Schools located in cities with populations between 2,500 and 25,000 were assigned a code of 6 (small town). All remaining schools were put in an uncoded pool.

4. The remaining schools that could be coded were placed in category 7 (rural, outside an MSA).

The uncoded schools that did not match to the Census block level were coded using the old methodology.

1. Addresses were checked for an incorporated place code. Those that matched the central city code of a metropolitan area were coded as 1 or 2, depending on the population of the city.

2. Addresses were then checked for metropolitan area status. Those that were determined to be inside a metropolitan area with an urban status were coded as 3 or 4, depending upon the population of the metropolitan area. Those within a metropolitan area with a rural status were coded as 8.

3. The remaining schools that were situated in an incorporated place were then matched to the populations of those places. Those whose populations were 25,000 or greater were assigned a code of 5. Those whose populations fell between 2,500 and 25,000 were assigned a code of 6.

4. Remaining schools that had sufficient addresses were assigned a code of 7.

5. Schools that had critical missing address information had their locale codes pulled forward from the previous survey (where they existed).

6. Schools that could not be assigned a code under either method were assigned a code of N. Included among these were Department of Defense dependents (overseas) schools, schools in outlying areas whose geographical and governmental structures do not fit into the definitional scheme used to derive the codes, and closed schools.

If errors are found on the CCD Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey file, the file is corrected a year later. The SY 1998–99 file released in September 2000 was revised in March 2001, but errors were made during the assignment process, some of which can be attributed to the change in the name and county code for Miami-Dade County, FL. The March 2001 locale code corrections were erroneous and were corrected in July 2001.

Table 5.—Record counts by locale code for the two versions of the SY 1998-99 School Universe file

Locale Code	Original 1998-99 Locale Codes (September 2000)	Revised 1998-99 Locale Codes (July 2001)
1	10,514	10,868
2	11,135	11,202
3	22,946	21,488
4	9,802	7,799
5	1,183	1,214
6	11,240	10,864
7	17,328	17,783
8	6,879	9,844
N	1,858	1,823
Total	92,885	92,885

Table 6.—Counts by method and code for revised 1998–99 locale codes

Locale Code	New Method	Old Method	Total
1	10,069	799	10,868
2	9,730	1,472	11,202
3	17,495	3,993	21,488
4	5,712	2,087	7,799
5	978	236	1,214
6	6,729	4,135	10,864
7	5,813	11,970	17,783
8	7,112	2,732	9,844
N	-	1,823	1,823
Total	63,638	29,247	92,885

Table 7 shows the school locale code assignment method used by school year. Information presented in the table includes the year of the Census files and metropolitan area definitions, whether or not codes were carried over from previous years, whether or not state CCD

coordinators could make changes to the codes that had been carried over, and what agency or group was responsible for assigning the codes.

Table 7.—School Locale Code Assignment by School Year

School Year	Assignment Method
1987–88	Locale codes based on population data from 1980 Census and metropolitan area definitions of 1983. NCES staff assigned codes to all eligible schools on the CCD Public School Universe file.
1988–89	Locale codes based on population data from 1980 Census and metropolitan area definitions of 1983. Existing schools had locale codes pulled forward from prior year, with possible changes made by state CCD coordinator. NCES staff assigned codes to all new eligible schools on the CCD Public School Universe file.
1989–90	Locale codes based on population data from 1980 Census and metropolitan area definitions of 1983. Existing schools had locale codes pulled forward from prior year, with possible changes made by state CCD coordinator. NCES staff assigned codes to all new eligible schools on the CCD Public School Universe file.
1990–91	Locale codes based on population data from 1980 Census and metropolitan area definitions of 1983. Existing schools had locale codes pulled forward from prior year, with possible changes made by state CCD coordinator. NCES staff assigned codes to all new eligible schools on the CCD Public School Universe file.
1991–92	Locale codes based on population data from 1980 Census and metropolitan area definitions of 1983. Existing schools had locale codes pulled forward from prior year, with possible changes made by state CCD coordinator. Pinkerton Computer Consultants assigned codes to all new eligible schools on the CCD Public School Universe file.
1992–93	Locale codes based on population data from 1980 Census and metropolitan area definitions of 1983. Existing schools had locale codes pulled forward from prior year, with possible changes made by state CCD coordinator. Pinkerton Computer Consultants assigned codes to all new eligible schools on the CCD Public School Universe file.
1993–94	Locale codes based on population data from 1980 Census and metropolitan area definitions of 1983. Existing schools had locale codes pulled forward from prior year, with possible changes made by state CCD coordinator. Pinkerton Computer Consultants assigned codes to all new eligible schools on the CCD Public School Universe file.
1994–95	Locale codes based on population data from 1990 Census and metropolitan area definitions of 1990. Existing schools had locale codes pulled forward from prior year, with possible changes made by state CCD coordinator. The Geography Division of the Bureau of the Census assigned codes to all new eligible schools on the CCD Public School Universe file.
1995–96	Locale codes based on population data from 1990 Census and metropolitan area definitions of 1990. Existing schools had locale codes pulled forward from prior year, with possible changes made by state CCD coordinator. The Geography Division of the Bureau of the Census assigned codes to all new eligible schools on the CCD Public School Universe file.
1996–97	Locale codes based on population data from 1990 Census and metropolitan area definitions of 1990. Existing schools had locale codes pulled forward from prior year, with possible changes made by state CCD coordinator. The Geography Division of the Bureau of the Census assigned codes to all new eligible schools on the CCD Public School Universe file.
1997–98	Locale codes based on population data from 1990 Census and metropolitan area definitions of 1990. Existing schools had locale codes pulled forward from prior year. State CCD coordinators could NOT make changes to computer-assigned codes. The Geography Division of the Bureau of the Census assigned codes to all new eligible schools on the CCD Public School Universe file.
1998–99	Locale codes based on population data from 1990. Census and metropolitan area definitions of 1990. All codes were computer-assigned. State CCD coordinators could not make changes to the codes. The Geography Division of the Bureau of the Census assigned the codes.
1999–2000	Locale codes based on population data from 1990 Census and metropolitan area definitions of 1990. All codes were computer-assigned. State CCD coordinators could not make changes to the codes. The Geography Division of the Bureau of the Census assigned the codes.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Programs Using School Locale Code to Allocate Funds

Some federal programs use school locale codes as part of the criteria for eligibility for funding. For example, schools applying for e-rate (universal rate) discounts on eligible telecommunication services can receive discounts ranging from 20 percent to 90 percent, depending on economic need and location (urban or rural).

The Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) uses school locale codes in conjunction with average daily attendance to determine eligibility for funds. A local education agency is eligible to use for REAP if the average daily attendance (ADA) of students in all schools in the district is fewer than 600 and all the schools in the district have a school locale code of 7 or 8. Funding must be used in accordance with REAP alternative uses. More information is available online at http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/goals/goalspubs.html.

Applicants for the Safe Schools/Healthy Students program use district locale codes. For the application, "urban" districts include large city or mid-size city; "suburban" districts include urban fringe of a large or mid-size city; and "rural" districts include large town, small town, or rural.

School Locale Code Changes by Year

Initially, state education agencies (SEAs) were allowed to edit or change the locale codes assigned to schools in their state. It was assumed that SEAs had better knowledge of the geography in their state and the location of their schools, and there were thousands of schools that did not match the files used to determine locale codes. These changes were not checked in the usual edit routines, and some files subsequently were released with incorrect locale codes. Because some of the changes led to implausible locale code designations, such as all schools in a state being coded large town, beginning in SY 1997–98 states were no longer allowed to change locale codes. Furthermore, technology and geography databases have improved so that there is less need for coordinators to change locale codes.

While it was difficult to distinguish locale codes that had been corrected due to careful consideration and special knowledge from accidental changes that are erroneous, the restriction against state-made changes has, however, caused problems. In some states locale codes are used

to allocate money for particular programs. Schools that may have qualified based on such changes in the locale codes were disqualified under the new policy.

Table 8 shows the number of changes in school locale codes by state and year. The greatest number of changes obviously occurred in SY 1993–94 and SY 1997–98 when changes were made in how school locale codes were assigned. There are also instances prior to SY 1997–98 in which a large number of changes were made by states in one year and reversed the next year. Most of those changes were a shift from one locale code to another and then a change back to the original code.

Table 8.—Number of changes in school locale codes, by state, by year: 1987-88 to 1998-99

	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99
U.S. total	358	1,281	5,768	7,172	1,112	131	23,133	3,649	167	451	14,123	5,083
Alabama	0	0	0	1	0	0	431	42	3	19	744	87
Alaska	3	26	25	2	7	9	84	2	3	3	18	97
Arizona	3	0	0	19	0	0	430	59	0	13	240	158
Arkansas	0	0	0	15	0	0	177	24	0	6	90	88
California	1	50	0	0	0	0	2,600	411	0	44	1,169	269
Colorado	0	0	0	17	0	13	286	55	1	5	175	68
Connecticut	92	2	1	0	0	0	427	266	5	2	255	18
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Delaware	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	11	0	0	73	12
Florida	0	0	828	14	19	20	624	149	1	42	928	427
Georgia	0	0	0	6	0	1	377	29	1	3	335	109
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	0	0	198	2	0	2	43	43
Idaho	0	0	0	18	0	0	93	1	0	0	125	19
Illinois	0	0	0	1	0	0	583	26	2	5	297	192
Indiana	0	30	93	21	0	0	613	23	0	0	383	76
Iowa	0	0	0	2	0	1	86	13	0	2	76	62
Kansas	2	359	1,399	1,384	0	0	573	12	0	1	104	46
Kentucky	0	0	0	0	0	0	373	31	3	1	208	69
Louisiana	0	0	0	0	0	1	261	23	0	15	360	74
Maine	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	18	5	4	161	79
Maryland	0	0	0	0	0	0	180	41	0	6	222	49
Massachusetts	0	0	0	1,118	0	31	1,177	361	4	2	308	72
Michigan	0	1	0	2	0	0	971	226	9	21	847	168
Minnesota	0	1	0	0	0	1	588	17	5	9	140	141
Mississippi	114	17	0	0	0	0	186	11	0	1	116	35
Missouri	0	4	1	0	0	0	445	23	5	9	212	113
Montana	9	122	0	1	0	0	95	12	0	4	105	34
Nebraska	0	0	0	1,098	1,067	0	252	19	7	3	98	32
Nevada	0	0	0	1	0	0	205	40	0	5	107	29
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	42	0	0	185	31
New Jersey	0	0	0	0	0	0	775	341	0	17	326	63
New Mexico	19	1	2	0	0	0	251	9	9	6	87	50
New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,562	203	1	8	670	208
North Carolina	0	0	0	12	0	0	547	40	2	6	442	156
North Dakota	39	0	1	0	0	0	27	8	0	0	24	38
Ohio	31	5	3,414	3,391	16	19	1,329	144	18	56	944	149
Oklahoma	0	50	1	10	0	0	416	15	7	55	116	206
Oregon	1	573	0	6	0	0	193	11	1	7	244	103
Pennsylvania	0	32	0	3	0	0	1,092	184	1	2	766	254
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	2	0	171	75	0	2	60	12
South Carolina	0	0	1	1	0	0	273	53	2	8	344	98
South Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	29	96	1	0	0	55	6
Tennessee	0	0	0	2	0	0	264	41	2	8	235	117
Texas	2	0	0	11	0	2	1,769	169	11	27	789	462
Utah	1	0	0	1	1	0	128	14	0	3	108	11
Vermont	41	0	1	1	0	0	111	9	3	2	98	54
Virginia	0	8	1	0	0	1	403	190	0	3	305	118
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	3	525	78	54	4	479	133
West Virginia	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	22	2	4	89	68
Wisconsin	0	0	0	14	0	0	363	50	0	4	283	71
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	2	0	2	35	9

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data, "Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey," 1987-88 to 1998-1999.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Metro Status Code Methodology

Beginning with SY 1999–2000, the metro status codes were assigned primarily through the use of existing locale codes according to the following steps:

1. The agency file is matched to the school file. Agencies that do not have any associated schools assigned have their previous year's metro status code pulled forward. The resulting file from this matching is known as the main file.

2. Agencies with at least one associated school but no enrollment are separated from the main file.

3. The main file is then matched to the school file, and a count of locale codes by agency is obtained.

4. Any agency that had an associated school with a locale code of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 8 was then separated out for further analysis. The remaining agencies were assigned a locale code of 3.

5. Agencies having schools with a locale code of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 8 were then matched back to the school file. Enrollment numbers were aggregated up by locale code for each group of schools belonging to a specific locale code in the agency using the following two sets of groupings: 1) locale codes 1 and 2, and 2) locale codes 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. Those agencies whose schools in the first grouping had a greater enrollment than those in the second grouping were assigned a metro status code of 1. The remaining agencies were assigned a metro status code of 2.

6. The number of schools within each locale code for agencies with at least one associated school, but no enrollment were then determined. Those agencies that had an equal or greater number of schools in the first group — locale codes 1 and 2 — were assigned a metro status code of 1. Those that had a predominance of schools in the second group were assigned a metro status code of 2 if any school in the agency had a locale code other than 5, 6, or 7. Otherwise, they were assigned a code of 3.

7. Agencies that had only one school with no enrollment were assigned a metro status code of 1 if the school had a locale code of 1 or 2, a code of 2 if the school had a locale code of 3, 4, or 8, and a code of 3 if the school had a locale code of 5, 6, or 7.

8. Agencies with no associated schools, and no prior year code were assigned a code based on the city listed in the location address (or mailing address where no location address was provided).

9. Metro status codes of 3 were changed to 2 if the district has a numeric value other than 000000 in the CMSA field.

District-Level Locale Code Methodology

A method of assigning locale to school districts or local education agencies (LEAs) was developed in 1993. The locale code of the most frequently occurring school locale code in the district was assigned to the district without regard to student counts. Pinkerton Computer Consultants Inc. was responsible for this procedure until SY 1999-2000. At that time, Census assumed the task of assigning district locale codes.

The following steps are used to assign locale codes. Once a district meets the criteria for assigning a code, it is removed from consideration in the following steps.

1. If 75 percent or more of all the schools in a district have the same locale code, then assign that code to the school district.

2. If 75 percent or more of all the schools in a district have locale codes 1 or 2, or if 75 percent or more of the schools in a district have locale codes 3 or 4, or if 75 percent or more of the schools in a district have locale codes 5, 6, or 7, then assign the code that is assigned to the largest number of schools in the district.

3. If 75 percent or more of all the schools in a district have locale codes 1 or 3, or if 75 percent or more of the schools in a district have locale codes 2 or 4, or if 75 percent or more of the schools in a district have locale codes 6 or 7, then assign the code that is assigned to the largest number of schools in the district.

4. If 75 percent or more of all the schools in a district are coded 1, 2, 3, or 4 then assign the code that was assigned to the largest number of schools in the district.

5. If 75 percent or more of all the schools in a district are coded 5, 6, or 7 then assign the code that was assigned to the largest number of schools in the district.

6. Assign the code that was assigned to the largest number of schools within the district.

These procedures were modified slightly in 1998-99 when the eighth locale code was added. In the second step, schools coded as 8 are combined with those coded 3 and 4. In the third step, schools coded as 8 are combined with those coded as 1 and 3, and with those coded 2 and 4. In the fourth step, schools coded as 8 are combined with those coded 1, 2, 3 and 4.

In the 2000-2001 CCD collection cycle, the school district locale codes will be assigned based on the number of students enrolled in schools, by locale code. The 6-step process above will be modified to a 2-step process, as follows:

1. If greater than 50 percent of students attend schools in a single locale category, then assign that category to the LEA.

2. Group schools with locale codes 1 and 2 in one group; 3, 4, and 8 in another group; and 5, 6 and 7 in another group. Determine the group that has the largest number of students, and assign the locale code with the largest number of students in that group. If the number of students between two or more groups is the same, then assign the largest (i.e. most rural) locale code.

Conclusion

The definitions and methodology have been revised since school locale codes were first introduced. These changes have been made because of the information collected about schools, computer databases available, and feedback from users of the CCD. Additional changes will be made when warranted.

GLOSSARY

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provides the definitions used for metropolitan areas (MAs), including metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs), consolidated metropolitan statistical areas (CMSAs), and primary metropolitan statistical areas (PMSAs). These definitions are updated annually, usually at the end of June. OMB establishes and maintains the definitions of MAs solely for statistical purposes.

Metropolitan area. Currently, an MA consists of a core area containing a large population nucleus, together with adjacent communities having a high degree of social and economic integration with that core. MAs generally include a city or a Census Bureau-defined urbanized area (UA) with 50,000 or more inhabitants. The county or counties that contain the large city or the UA are the central counties of the MA. Additional outlying counties are included in the MA if the counties meet specified requirements of commuting to or from the central counties and other selected requirements of metropolitan character. "Metropolitan area" is a collective term that refers to metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs), consolidated metropolitan statistical areas (CMSAs), and primary metropolitan statistical areas (PMSAs).

Historical and current information on metropolitan areas and their components can be found online at http://www.census.gov/population/www/estimates/metrodef.html

Central city. The largest city of a metropolitan statistical area or a consolidated metropolitan statistical area, plus additional cities that meet specified statistical criteria.

Listing of NCES Working Papers to Date

Working papers can be downloaded as pdf files from the NCES Electronic Catalog (http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/). You can also contact Sheilah Jupiter at (202) 502–7444 (sheilah_jupiter@ed.gov) if you are interested in any of the following papers.

Listing of NCES Working Papers by Program Area

No.	Title	NCES contact
Baccalaureate and Beyond (B&B)		
98–15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
2001–15	Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study: 2000/01 Follow-Up Field Test Methodology Report	Andrew G. Malizio
Beginning Postsecondary Students (BPS) Longitudinal Study		
98–11	Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study First Follow-up (BPS:96–98) Field Test Report	Aurora D'Amico
98–15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
1999–15	Projected Postsecondary Outcomes of 1992 High School Graduates	Aurora D'Amico
2001–04	Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study: 1996–2001 (BPS:1996/2001) Field Test Methodology Report	Paula Knepper
Common Core of Data (CCD)		
95–12	Rural Education Data User's Guide	Samuel Peng
96–19	Assessment and Analysis of School-Level Expenditures	William J. Fowler, Jr.
97–15	Customer Service Survey: Common Core of Data Coordinators	Lee Hoffman
97–43	Measuring Inflation in Public School Costs	William J. Fowler, Jr.
98–15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
1999–03	Evaluation of the 1996–97 Nonfiscal Common Core of Data Surveys Data Collection, Processing, and Editing Cycle	Beth Young
2000–12	Coverage Evaluation of the 1994–95 Common Core of Data: Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey	Beth Young
2000–13	Non-professional Staff in the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and Common Core of Data (CCD)	Kerry Gruber
2001–09	An Assessment of the Accuracy of CCD Data: A Comparison of 1988, 1989, and 1990 CCD Data with 1990–91 SASS Data	John Sietsema
2001–14	Evaluation of the Common Core of Data (CCD) Finance Data Imputations	Frank Johnson
2002–02	School Locale Codes 1987 - 2000	Frank Johnson
Data Development		
2000–16a	Lifelong Learning NCES Task Force: Final Report Volume I	Lisa Hudson
2000–16b	Lifelong Learning NCES Task Force: Final Report Volume II	Lisa Hudson
Decennial Census School District Project		
95–12	Rural Education Data User's Guide	Samuel Peng
96–04	Census Mapping Project/School District Data Book	Tai Phan
98–07	Decennial Census School District Project Planning Report	Tai Phan
2001–12	Customer Feedback on the 1990 Census Mapping Project	Dan Kasprzyk
Early Childhood Longitudinal Study (ECLS)		
96–08	How Accurate are Teacher Judgments of Students' Academic Performance?	Jerry West
96–18	Assessment of Social Competence, Adaptive Behaviors, and Approaches to Learning with Young Children	Jerry West
97–24	Formulating a Design for the ECLS: A Review of Longitudinal Studies	Jerry West
97–36	Measuring the Quality of Program Environments in Head Start and Other Early Childhood Programs: A Review and Recommendations for Future Research	Jerry West
1999–01	A Birth Cohort Study: Conceptual and Design Considerations and Rationale	Jerry West

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

No.	Title	NCES contact
2000–04	Selected Papers on Education Surveys: Papers Presented at the 1998 and 1999 ASA and 1999 AAPOR Meetings	Dan Kasprzyk
2001–02	Measuring Father Involvement in Young Children's Lives: Recommendations for a Fatherhood Module for the ECLS-B	Jerry West
2001–03	Measures of Socio-Emotional Development in Middle Childhood	Elvira Hausken
2001–06	Papers from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Studies Program: Presented at the 2001 AERA and SRCD Meetings	Jerry West
Education Finance Statistics Center (EDFIN)		
94–05	Cost-of-Education Differentials Across the States	William J. Fowler, Jr.
96–19	Assessment and Analysis of School-Level Expenditures	William J. Fowler, Jr.
97–43	Measuring Inflation in Public School Costs	William J. Fowler, Jr.
98–04	Geographic Variations in Public Schools' Costs	William J. Fowler, Jr.
1999–16	Measuring Resources in Education: From Accounting to the Resource Cost Model Approach	William J. Fowler, Jr.
High School and Beyond (HS&B)		
95–12	Rural Education Data User's Guide	Samuel Peng
1999–05	Procedures Guide for Transcript Studies	Dawn Nelson
1999–06	1998 Revision of the Secondary School Taxonomy	Dawn Nelson
HS Transcript Studies		
1999–05	Procedures Guide for Transcript Studies	Dawn Nelson
1999–06	1998 Revision of the Secondary School Taxonomy	Dawn Nelson
International Adult Literacy Survey (IALS)		
97–33	Adult Literacy: An International Perspective	Marilyn Binkley
Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)		
97–27	Pilot Test of IPEDS Finance Survey	Peter Stowe
98–15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
2000–14	IPEDS Finance Data Comparisons Under the 1997 Financial Accounting Standards for Private, Not-for-Profit Institutes: A Concept Paper	Peter Stowe
National Assessment of Adult Literacy (NAAL)		
98–17	Developing the National Assessment of Adult Literacy: Recommendations from Stakeholders	Sheida White
1999–09a	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: An Overview	Alex Sedlacek
1999–09b	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Sample Design	Alex Sedlacek
1999–09c	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Weighting and Population Estimates	Alex Sedlacek
1999–09d	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Development of the Survey Instruments	Alex Sedlacek
1999–09e	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Scaling and Proficiency Estimates	Alex Sedlacek
1999–09f	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Interpreting the Adult Literacy Scales and Literacy Levels	Alex Sedlacek
1999–09g	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Literacy Levels and the Response Probability Convention	Alex Sedlacek
2000–05	Secondary Statistical Modeling With the National Assessment of Adult Literacy: Implications for the Design of the Background Questionnaire	Sheida White
2000–06	Using Telephone and Mail Surveys as a Supplement or Alternative to Door-to-Door Surveys in the Assessment of Adult Literacy	Sheida White
2000–07	"How Much Literacy is Enough?" Issues in Defining and Reporting Performance Standards for the National Assessment of Adult Literacy	Sheida White
2000–08	Evaluation of the 1992 NALS Background Survey Questionnaire: An Analysis of Uses with Recommendations for Revisions	Sheida White
2000–09	Demographic Changes and Literacy Development in a Decade	Sheida White
2001–08	Assessing the Lexile Framework: Results of a Panel Meeting	Sheida White

No.	Title	NCES contact
National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)		
95–12	Rural Education Data User's Guide	Samuel Peng
97–29	Can State Assessment Data be Used to Reduce State NAEP Sample Sizes?	Steven Gorman
97–30	ACT's NAEP Redesign Project: Assessment Design is the Key to Useful and Stable Assessment Results	Steven Gorman
97–31	NAEP Reconfigured: An Integrated Redesign of the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Steven Gorman
97–32	Innovative Solutions to Intractable Large Scale Assessment (Problem 2: Background Questionnaires)	Steven Gorman
97–37	Optimal Rating Procedures and Methodology for NAEP Open-ended Items	Steven Gorman
97–44	Development of a SASS 1993–94 School-Level Student Achievement Subfile: Using State Assessments and State NAEP, Feasibility Study	Michael Ross
98–15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
1999–05	Procedures Guide for Transcript Studies	Dawn Nelson
1999–06	1998 Revision of the Secondary School Taxonomy	Dawn Nelson
2001–07	A Comparison of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the Third International Mathematics and Science Study Repeat (TIMSS-R), and the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)	Arnold Goldstein
2001–08	Assessing the Lexile Framework: Results of a Panel Meeting	Sheida White
2001–11	Impact of Selected Background Variables on Students' NAEP Math Performance	Arnold Goldstein
2001–13	The Effects of Accommodations on the Assessment of LEP Students in NAEP	Arnold Goldstein
2001–19	The Measurement of Home Background Indicators: Cognitive Laboratory Investigations of the Responses of Fourth and Eighth Graders to Questionnaire Items and Parental Assessment of the Invasiveness of These Items	Arnold Goldstein
National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88)		
95–04	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988: Second Follow-up Questionnaire Content Areas and Research Issues	Jeffrey Owings
95–05	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988: Conducting Trend Analyses of NLS-72, HS&B, and NELS:88 Seniors	Jeffrey Owings
95–06	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988: Conducting Cross-Cohort Comparisons Using HS&B, NAEP, and NELS:88 Academic Transcript Data	Jeffrey Owings
95–07	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988: Conducting Trend Analyses HS&B and NELS:88 Sophomore Cohort Dropouts	Jeffrey Owings
95–12	Rural Education Data User's Guide	Samuel Peng
95–14	Empirical Evaluation of Social, Psychological, & Educational Construct Variables Used in NCES Surveys	Samuel Peng
96–03	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88) Research Framework and Issues	Jeffrey Owings
98–06	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88) Base Year through Second Follow-Up: Final Methodology Report	Ralph Lee
98–09	High School Curriculum Structure: Effects on Coursetaking and Achievement in Mathematics for High School Graduates—An Examination of Data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988	Jeffrey Owings
98–15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
1999–05	Procedures Guide for Transcript Studies	Dawn Nelson
1999–06	1998 Revision of the Secondary School Taxonomy	Dawn Nelson
1999–15	Projected Postsecondary Outcomes of 1992 High School Graduates	Aurora D'Amico
2001–16	Imputation of Test Scores in the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988	Ralph Lee
National Household Education Survey (NHES)		
95–12	Rural Education Data User's Guide	Samuel Peng
96–13	Estimation of Response Bias in the NHES:95 Adult Education Survey	Steven Kaufman
96–14	The 1995 National Household Education Survey: Reinterview Results for the Adult Education Component	Steven Kaufman
96–20	1991 National Household Education Survey (NHES:91) Questionnaires: Screener, Early Childhood Education, and Adult Education	Kathryn Chandler
96–21	1993 National Household Education Survey (NHES:93) Questionnaires: Screener, School Readiness, and School Safety and Discipline	Kathryn Chandler

No.	Title	NCES contact
96–22	1995 National Household Education Survey (NHES:95) Questionnaires: Screener, Early Childhood Program Participation, and Adult Education	Kathryn Chandler
96–29	Undercoverage Bias in Estimates of Characteristics of Adults and 0- to 2-Year-Olds in the 1995 National Household Education Survey (NHES:95)	Kathryn Chandler
96–30	Comparison of Estimates from the 1995 National Household Education Survey (NHES:95)	Kathryn Chandler
97–02	Telephone Coverage Bias and Recorded Interviews in the 1993 National Household Education Survey (NHES:93)	Kathryn Chandler
97–03	1991 and 1995 National Household Education Survey Questionnaires: NHES:91 Screener, NHES:91 Adult Education, NHES:95 Basic Screener, and NHES:95 Adult Education	Kathryn Chandler
97–04	Design, Data Collection, Monitoring, Interview Administration Time, and Data Editing in the 1993 National Household Education Survey (NHES:93)	Kathryn Chandler
97–05	Unit and Item Response, Weighting, and Imputation Procedures in the 1993 National Household Education Survey (NHES:93)	Kathryn Chandler
97–06	Unit and Item Response, Weighting, and Imputation Procedures in the 1995 National Household Education Survey (NHES:95)	Kathryn Chandler
97–08	Design, Data Collection, Interview Timing, and Data Editing in the 1995 National Household Education Survey	Kathryn Chandler
97–19	National Household Education Survey of 1995: Adult Education Course Coding Manual	Peter Stowe
97–20	National Household Education Survey of 1995: Adult Education Course Code Merge Files User's Guide	Peter Stowe
97–25	1996 National Household Education Survey (NHES:96) Questionnaires: Screener/Household and Library, Parent and Family Involvement in Education and Civic Involvement, Youth Civic Involvement, and Adult Civic Involvement	Kathryn Chandler
97–28	Comparison of Estimates in the 1996 National Household Education Survey	Kathryn Chandler
97–34	Comparison of Estimates from the 1993 National Household Education Survey	Kathryn Chandler
97–35	Design, Data Collection, Interview Administration Time, and Data Editing in the 1996 National Household Education Survey	Kathryn Chandler
97–38	Reinterview Results for the Parent and Youth Components of the 1996 National Household Education Survey	Kathryn Chandler
97–39	Undercoverage Bias in Estimates of Characteristics of Households and Adults in the 1996 National Household Education Survey	Kathryn Chandler
97–40	Unit and Item Response Rates, Weighting, and Imputation Procedures in the 1996 National Household Education Survey	Kathryn Chandler
98–03	Adult Education in the 1990s: A Report on the 1991 National Household Education Survey	Peter Stowe
98–10	Adult Education Participation Decisions and Barriers: Review of Conceptual Frameworks and Empirical Studies	Peter Stowe
National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972 (NLS-72)		
95–12	Rural Education Data User's Guide	Samuel Peng
National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS)		
96–17	National Postsecondary Student Aid Study: 1996 Field Test Methodology Report	Andrew G. Malizio
2000–17	National Postsecondary Student Aid Study:2000 Field Test Methodology Report	Andrew G. Malizio
National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF)		
97–26	Strategies for Improving Accuracy of Postsecondary Faculty Lists	Linda Zimbler
98–15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
2000–01	1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99) Field Test Report	Linda Zimbler
Postsecondary Education Descriptive Analysis Reports (PEDAR)		
2000–11	Financial Aid Profile of Graduate Students in Science and Engineering	Aurora D'Amico
Private School Universe Survey (PSS)		
95–16	Intersurvey Consistency in NCES Private School Surveys	Steven Kaufman
95–17	Estimates of Expenditures for Private K–12 Schools	Stephen Broughman
96–16	Strategies for Collecting Finance Data from Private Schools	Stephen Broughman
96–26	Improving the Coverage of Private Elementary-Secondary Schools	Steven Kaufman
96–27	Intersurvey Consistency in NCES Private School Surveys for 1993–94	Steven Kaufman

No.	Title	NCES contact
97–07	The Determinants of Per-Pupil Expenditures in Private Elementary and Secondary Schools: An Exploratory Analysis	Stephen Broughman
97–22	Collection of Private School Finance Data: Development of a Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
98–15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
2000–04	Selected Papers on Education Surveys: Papers Presented at the 1998 and 1999 ASA and 1999 AAPOR Meetings	Dan Kasprzyk
2000–15	Feasibility Report: School-Level Finance Pretest, Private School Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
Recent College Graduates (RCG)		
98–15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS)		
94–01	Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) Papers Presented at Meetings of the American Statistical Association	Dan Kasprzyk
94–02	Generalized Variance Estimate for Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS)	Dan Kasprzyk
94–03	1991 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) Reinterview Response Variance Report	Dan Kasprzyk
94–04	The Accuracy of Teachers' Self-reports on their Postsecondary Education: Teacher Transcript Study, Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
94–06	Six Papers on Teachers from the 1990–91 Schools and Staffing Survey and Other Related Surveys	Dan Kasprzyk
95–01	Schools and Staffing Survey: 1994 Papers Presented at the 1994 Meeting of the American Statistical Association	Dan Kasprzyk
95–02	QED Estimates of the 1990–91 Schools and Staffing Survey: Deriving and Comparing QED School Estimates with CCD Estimates	Dan Kasprzyk
95–03	Schools and Staffing Survey: 1990–91 SASS Cross-Questionnaire Analysis	Dan Kasprzyk
95–08	CCD Adjustment to the 1990–91 SASS: A Comparison of Estimates	Dan Kasprzyk
95–09	The Results of the 1993 Teacher List Validation Study (TLVS)	Dan Kasprzyk
95–10	The Results of the 1991–92 Teacher Follow-up Survey (TFS) Reinterview and Extensive Reconciliation	Dan Kasprzyk
95–11	Measuring Instruction, Curriculum Content, and Instructional Resources: The Status of Recent Work	Sharon Bobbitt & John Ralph
95–12	Rural Education Data User's Guide	Samuel Peng
95–14	Empirical Evaluation of Social, Psychological, & Educational Construct Variables Used in NCES Surveys	Samuel Peng
95–15	Classroom Instructional Processes: A Review of Existing Measurement Approaches and Their Applicability for the Teacher Follow-up Survey	Sharon Bobbitt
95–16	Intersurvey Consistency in NCES Private School Surveys	Steven Kaufman
95–18	An Agenda for Research on Teachers and Schools: Revisiting NCES' Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
96–01	Methodological Issues in the Study of Teachers' Careers: Critical Features of a Truly Longitudinal Study	Dan Kasprzyk
96–02	Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS): 1995 Selected papers presented at the 1995 Meeting of the American Statistical Association	Dan Kasprzyk
96–05	Cognitive Research on the Teacher Listing Form for the Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
96–06	The Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) for 1998–99: Design Recommendations to Inform Broad Education Policy	Dan Kasprzyk
96–07	Should SASS Measure Instructional Processes and Teacher Effectiveness?	Dan Kasprzyk
96–09	Making Data Relevant for Policy Discussions: Redesigning the School Administrator Questionnaire for the 1998–99 SASS	Dan Kasprzyk
96–10	1998–99 Schools and Staffing Survey: Issues Related to Survey Depth	Dan Kasprzyk
96–11	Towards an Organizational Database on America's Schools: A Proposal for the Future of SASS, with comments on School Reform, Governance, and Finance	Dan Kasprzyk
96–12	Predictors of Retention, Transfer, and Attrition of Special and General Education Teachers: Data from the 1989 Teacher Followup Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
96–15	Nested Structures: District-Level Data in the Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
96–23	Linking Student Data to SASS: Why, When, How	Dan Kasprzyk
96–24	National Assessments of Teacher Quality	Dan Kasprzyk
96–25	Measures of Inservice Professional Development: Suggested Items for the 1998–1999 Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
96–28	Student Learning, Teaching Quality, and Professional Development: Theoretical Linkages, Current Measurement, and Recommendations for Future Data Collection	Mary Rollefson

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

No.	Title	NCES contact
97–01	Selected Papers on Education Surveys: Papers Presented at the 1996 Meeting of the American Statistical Association	Dan Kasprzyk
97–07	The Determinants of Per-Pupil Expenditures in Private Elementary and Secondary Schools: An Exploratory Analysis	Stephen Broughman
97–09	Status of Data on Crime and Violence in Schools: Final Report	Lee Hoffman
97–10	Report of Cognitive Research on the Public and Private School Teacher Questionnaires for the Schools and Staffing Survey 1993–94 School Year	Dan Kasprzyk
97–11	International Comparisons of Inservice Professional Development	Dan Kasprzyk
97–12	Measuring School Reform: Recommendations for Future SASS Data Collection	Mary Rollefson
97–14	Optimal Choice of Periodicities for the Schools and Staffing Survey: Modeling and Analysis	Steven Kaufman
97–18	Improving the Mail Return Rates of SASS Surveys: A Review of the Literature	Steven Kaufman
97–22	Collection of Private School Finance Data: Development of a Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
97–23	Further Cognitive Research on the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) Teacher Listing Form	Dan Kasprzyk
97–41	Selected Papers on the Schools and Staffing Survey: Papers Presented at the 1997 Meeting of the American Statistical Association	Steve Kaufman
97–42	Improving the Measurement of Staffing Resources at the School Level: The Development of Recommendations for NCES for the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS)	Mary Rollefson
97–44	Development of a SASS 1993–94 School-Level Student Achievement Subfile: Using State Assessments and State NAEP, Feasibility Study	Michael Ross
98–01	Collection of Public School Expenditure Data: Development of a Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
98–02	Response Variance in the 1993–94 Schools and Staffing Survey: A Reinterview Report	Steven Kaufman
98–04	Geographic Variations in Public Schools' Costs	William J. Fowler, Jr.
98–05	SASS Documentation: 1993–94 SASS Student Sampling Problems; Solutions for Determining the Numerators for the SASS Private School (3B) Second-Stage Factors	Steven Kaufman
98–08	The Redesign of the Schools and Staffing Survey for 1999–2000: A Position Paper	Dan Kasprzyk
98–12	A Bootstrap Variance Estimator for Systematic PPS Sampling	Steven Kaufman
98–13	Response Variance in the 1994–95 Teacher Follow-up Survey	Steven Kaufman
98–14	Variance Estimation of Imputed Survey Data	Steven Kaufman
98–15	Development of a Prototype System for Accessing Linked NCES Data	Steven Kaufman
98–16	A Feasibility Study of Longitudinal Design for Schools and Staffing Survey	Stephen Broughman
1999–02	Tracking Secondary Use of the Schools and Staffing Survey Data: Preliminary Results	Dan Kasprzyk
1999–04	Measuring Teacher Qualifications	Dan Kasprzyk
1999–07	Collection of Resource and Expenditure Data on the Schools and Staffing Survey	Stephen Broughman
1999–08	Measuring Classroom Instructional Processes: Using Survey and Case Study Fieldtest Results to Improve Item Construction	Dan Kasprzyk
1999–10	What Users Say About Schools and Staffing Survey Publications	Dan Kasprzyk
1999–12	1993–94 Schools and Staffing Survey: Data File User's Manual, Volume III: Public-Use Codebook	Kerry Gruber
1999–13	1993–94 Schools and Staffing Survey: Data File User's Manual, Volume IV: Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Restricted-Use Codebook	Kerry Gruber
1999–14	1994–95 Teacher Followup Survey: Data File User's Manual, Restricted-Use Codebook	Kerry Gruber
1999–17	Secondary Use of the Schools and Staffing Survey Data	Susan Wiley
2000–04	Selected Papers on Education Surveys: Papers Presented at the 1998 and 1999 ASA and 1999 AAPOR Meetings	Dan Kasprzyk
2000–10	A Research Agenda for the 1999–2000 Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
2000–13	Non-professional Staff in the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and Common Core of Data (CCD)	Kerry Gruber
2000–18	Feasibility Report: School-Level Finance Pretest, Public School District Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS)		
2001–01	Cross-National Variation in Educational Preparation for Adulthood: From Early Adolescence to Young Adulthood	Elvira Hausken
2001–05	Using TIMSS to Analyze Correlates of Performance Variation in Mathematics	Patrick Gonzales
2001–07	A Comparison of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the Third International Mathematics and Science Study Repeat (TIMSS-R), and the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)	Arnold Goldstein
2002-01	Legal and Ethical Issues in the Use of Video in Education Research	Patrick Gonzales

Listing of NCES Working Papers by Subject

No.	Title	NCES contact
Achievement (student) - mathematics		
2001–05	Using TIMSS to Analyze Correlates of Performance Variation in Mathematics	Patrick Gonzales
Adult education		
96–14	The 1995 National Household Education Survey: Reinterview Results for the Adult Education Component	Steven Kaufman
96–20	1991 National Household Education Survey (NHES:91) Questionnaires: Screener, Early Childhood Education, and Adult Education	Kathryn Chandler
96–22	1995 National Household Education Survey (NHES:95) Questionnaires: Screener, Early Childhood Program Participation, and Adult Education	Kathryn Chandler
98–03	Adult Education in the 1990s: A Report on the 1991 National Household Education Survey	Peter Stowe
98–10	Adult Education Participation Decisions and Barriers: Review of Conceptual Frameworks and Empirical Studies	Peter Stowe
1999–11	Data Sources on Lifelong Learning Available from the National Center for Education Statistics	Lisa Hudson
2000–16a	Lifelong Learning NCES Task Force: Final Report Volume I	Lisa Hudson
2000–16b	Lifelong Learning NCES Task Force: Final Report Volume II	Lisa Hudson
Adult literacy—see Literacy of adults		
American Indian – education		
1999–13	1993–94 Schools and Staffing Survey: Data File User's Manual, Volume IV: Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Restricted-Use Codebook	Kerry Gruber
Assessment/achievement		
95–12	Rural Education Data User's Guide	Samuel Peng
95–13	Assessing Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficiency	James Houser
97–29	Can State Assessment Data be Used to Reduce State NAEP Sample Sizes?	Larry Ogle
97–30	ACT's NAEP Redesign Project: Assessment Design is the Key to Useful and Stable Assessment Results	Larry Ogle
97–31	NAEP Reconfigured: An Integrated Redesign of the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Larry Ogle
97–32	Innovative Solutions to Intractable Large Scale Assessment (Problem 2: Background Questions)	Larry Ogle
97–37	Optimal Rating Procedures and Methodology for NAEP Open-ended Items	Larry Ogle
97–44	Development of a SASS 1993–94 School-Level Student Achievement Subfile: Using State Assessments and State NAEP, Feasibility Study	Michael Ross
98–09	High School Curriculum Structure: Effects on Coursetaking and Achievement in Mathematics for High School Graduates—An Examination of Data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988	Jeffrey Owings
2001–07	A Comparison of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the Third International Mathematics and Science Study Repeat (TIMSS-R), and the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)	Arnold Goldstein
2001–11	Impact of Selected Background Variables on Students' NAEP Math Performance	Arnold Goldstein
2001–13	The Effects of Accommodations on the Assessment of LEP Students in NAEP	Arnold Goldstein
2001–19	The Measurement of Home Background Indicators: Cognitive Laboratory Investigations of the Responses of Fourth and Eighth Graders to Questionnaire Items and Parental Assessment of the Invasiveness of These Items	Arnold Goldstein
Beginning students in postsecondary education		
98–11	Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study First Follow-up (BPS:96–98) Field Test Report	Aurora D'Amico
2001–04	Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study: 1996–2001 (BPS:1996/2001) Field Test Methodology Report	Paula Knepper

No.	Title	NCES contact
Civic participation		
97–25	1996 National Household Education Survey (NHES:96) Questionnaires: Screener/Household and Library, Parent and Family Involvement in Education and Civic Involvement, Youth Civic Involvement, and Adult Civic Involvement	Kathryn Chandler
Climate of schools		
95–14	Empirical Evaluation of Social, Psychological, & Educational Construct Variables Used in NCES Surveys	Samuel Peng
Cost of education indices		
94–05	Cost-of-Education Differentials Across the States	William J. Fowler, Jr.
Course-taking		
95–12	Rural Education Data User's Guide	Samuel Peng
98–09	High School Curriculum Structure: Effects on Coursetaking and Achievement in Mathematics for High School Graduates—An Examination of Data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988	Jeffrey Owings
1999–05	Procedures Guide for Transcript Studies	Dawn Nelson
1999–06	1998 Revision of the Secondary School Taxonomy	Dawn Nelson
Crime		
97–09	Status of Data on Crime and Violence in Schools: Final Report	Lee Hoffman
Curriculum		
95–11	Measuring Instruction, Curriculum Content, and Instructional Resources: The Status of Recent Work	Sharon Bobbitt & John Ralph
98–09	High School Curriculum Structure: Effects on Coursetaking and Achievement in Mathematics for High School Graduates—An Examination of Data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988	Jeffrey Owings
Customer service		
1999–10	What Users Say About Schools and Staffing Survey Publications	Dan Kasprzyk
2000–02	Coordinating NCES Surveys: Options, Issues, Challenges, and Next Steps	Valena Plisko
2000–04	Selected Papers on Education Surveys: Papers Presented at the 1998 and 1999 ASA and 1999 AAPOR Meetings	Dan Kasprzyk
2001–12	Customer Feedback on the 1990 Census Mapping Project	Dan Kasprzyk
Data quality		
97–13	Improving Data Quality in NCES: Database-to-Report Process	Susan Ahmed
2001–11	Impact of Selected Background Variables on Students' NAEP Math Performance	Arnold Goldstein
2001–13	The Effects of Accommodations on the Assessment of LEP Students in NAEP	Arnold Goldstein
2001–19	The Measurement of Home Background Indicators: Cognitive Laboratory Investigations of the Responses of Fourth and Eighth Graders to Questionnaire Items and Parental Assessment of the Invasiveness of These Items	Arnold Goldstein
Data warehouse		
2000–04	Selected Papers on Education Surveys: Papers Presented at the 1998 and 1999 ASA and 1999 AAPOR Meetings	Dan Kasprzyk
Design effects		
2000–03	Strengths and Limitations of Using SUDAAN, Stata, and WesVarPC for Computing Variances from NCES Data Sets	Ralph Lee
Dropout rates, high school		
95–07	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988: Conducting Trend Analyses HS&B and NELS:88 Sophomore Cohort Dropouts	Jeffrey Owings

No.	Title	NCES contact
Early childhood education		
96–20	1991 National Household Education Survey (NHES:91) Questionnaires: Screener, Early Childhood Education, and Adult Education	Kathryn Chandler
96–22	1995 National Household Education Survey (NHES:95) Questionnaires: Screener, Early Childhood Program Participation, and Adult Education	Kathryn Chandler
97–24	Formulating a Design for the ECLS: A Review of Longitudinal Studies	Jerry West
97–36	Measuring the Quality of Program Environments in Head Start and Other Early Childhood Programs: A Review and Recommendations for Future Research	Jerry West
1999–01	A Birth Cohort Study: Conceptual and Design Considerations and Rationale	Jerry West
2001–02	Measuring Father Involvement in Young Children's Lives: Recommendations for a Fatherhood Module for the ECLS-B	Jerry West
2001–03	Measures of Socio-Emotional Development in Middle School	Elvira Hausken
2001–06	Papers from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Studies Program: Presented at the 2001 AERA and SRCD Meetings	Jerry West
Educational attainment		
98–11	Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study First Follow-up (BPS:96–98) Field Test Report	Aurora D'Amico
2001–15	Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study: 2000/01 Follow-Up Field Test Methodology Report	Andrew G. Malizio
Educational research		
2000–02	Coordinating NCES Surveys: Options, Issues, Challenges, and Next Steps	Valena Plisko
2002-01	Legal and Ethical Issues in the Use of Video in Education Research	Patrick Gonzales
Eighth-graders		
2001–05	Using TIMSS to Analyze Correlates of Performance Variation in Mathematics	Patrick Gonzales
Employment		
96–03	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88) Research Framework and Issues	Jeffrey Owings
98–11	Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study First Follow-up (BPS:96–98) Field Test Report	Aurora D'Amico
2000–16a	Lifelong Learning NCES Task Force: Final Report Volume I	Lisa Hudson
2000–16b	Lifelong Learning NCES Task Force: Final Report Volume II	Lisa Hudson
2001–01	Cross-National Variation in Educational Preparation for Adulthood: From Early Adolescence to Young Adulthood	Elvira Hausken
Employment – after college		
2001–15	Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study: 2000/01 Follow-Up Field Test Methodology Report	Andrew G. Malizio
Engineering		
2000–11	Financial Aid Profile of Graduate Students in Science and Engineering	Aurora D'Amico
Enrollment – after college		
2001–15	Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study: 2000/01 Follow-Up Field Test Methodology Report	Andrew G. Malizio
Faculty – higher education		
97–26	Strategies for Improving Accuracy of Postsecondary Faculty Lists	Linda Zimbler
2000–01	1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99) Field Test Report	Linda Zimbler
Fathers – role in education		
2001–02	Measuring Father Involvement in Young Children's Lives: Recommendations for a Fatherhood Module for the ECLS-B	Jerry West

No.	Title	NCES contact
Finance – elementary and secondary schools		
94–05	Cost-of-Education Differentials Across the States	William J. Fowler, Jr.
96–19	Assessment and Analysis of School-Level Expenditures	William J. Fowler, Jr.
98–01	Collection of Public School Expenditure Data: Development of a Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
1999–07	Collection of Resource and Expenditure Data on the Schools and Staffing Survey	Stephen Broughman
1999–16	Measuring Resources in Education: From Accounting to the Resource Cost Model Approach	William J. Fowler, Jr.
2000–18	Feasibility Report: School-Level Finance Pretest, Public School District Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
2001–14	Evaluation of the Common Core of Data (CCD) Finance Data Imputations	Frank Johnson
Finance – postsecondary		
97–27	Pilot Test of IPEDS Finance Survey	Peter Stowe
2000–14	IPEDS Finance Data Comparisons Under the 1997 Financial Accounting Standards for Private, Not-for-Profit Institutes: A Concept Paper	Peter Stowe
Finance – private schools		
95–17	Estimates of Expenditures for Private K–12 Schools	Stephen Broughman
96–16	Strategies for Collecting Finance Data from Private Schools	Stephen Broughman
97–07	The Determinants of Per-Pupil Expenditures in Private Elementary and Secondary Schools: An Exploratory Analysis	Stephen Broughman
97–22	Collection of Private School Finance Data: Development of a Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
1999–07	Collection of Resource and Expenditure Data on the Schools and Staffing Survey	Stephen Broughman
2000–15	Feasibility Report: School-Level Finance Pretest, Private School Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
Geography		
98–04	Geographic Variations in Public Schools' Costs	William J. Fowler, Jr.
Graduate students		
2000–11	Financial Aid Profile of Graduate Students in Science and Engineering	Aurora D'Amico
Graduates of postsecondary education		
2001–15	Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study: 2000/01 Follow-Up Field Test Methodology Report	Andrew G. Malizio
Imputation		
2000–04	Selected Papers on Education Surveys: Papers Presented at the 1998 and 1999 ASA and 1999 AAPOR Meeting	Dan Kasprzyk
2001–10	Comparison of Proc Impute and Schafer's Multiple Imputation Software	Sam Peng
2001–14	Evaluation of the Common Core of Data (CCD) Finance Data Imputations	Frank Johnson
2001–16	Imputation of Test Scores in the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988	Ralph Lee
2001–17	A Study of Imputation Algorithms	Ralph Lee
2001–18	A Study of Variance Estimation Methods	Ralph Lee
Inflation		
97–43	Measuring Inflation in Public School Costs	William J. Fowler, Jr.
Institution data		
2000–01	1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99) Field Test Report	Linda Zimbler
Instructional resources and practices		
95–11	Measuring Instruction, Curriculum Content, and Instructional Resources: The Status of Recent Work	Sharon Bobbitt & John Ralph
1999–08	Measuring Classroom Instructional Processes: Using Survey and Case Study Field Test Results to Improve Item Construction	Dan Kasprzyk
International comparisons		
97–11	International Comparisons of Inservice Professional Development	Dan Kasprzyk
97–16	International Education Expenditure Comparability Study: Final Report, Volume I	Shelley Burns

No.	Title	NCES contact
97–17	International Education Expenditure Comparability Study: Final Report, Volume II, Quantitative Analysis of Expenditure Comparability	Shelley Burns
2001–01	Cross-National Variation in Educational Preparation for Adulthood: From Early Adolescence to Young Adulthood	Elvira Hausken
2001–07	A Comparison of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the Third International Mathematics and Science Study Repeat (TIMSS-R), and the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)	Arnold Goldstein
International comparisons – math and science achievement		
2001–05	Using TIMSS to Analyze Correlates of Performance Variation in Mathematics	Patrick Gonzales
Libraries		
94–07	Data Comparability and Public Policy: New Interest in Public Library Data Papers Presented at Meetings of the American Statistical Association	Carrol Kindel
97–25	1996 National Household Education Survey (NHES:96) Questionnaires: Screener/Household and Library, Parent and Family Involvement in Education and Civic Involvement, Youth Civic Involvement, and Adult Civic Involvement	Kathryn Chandler
Limited English Proficiency		
95–13	Assessing Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficiency	James Houser
2001–11	Impact of Selected Background Variables on Students' NAEP Math Performance	Arnold Goldstein
2001–13	The Effects of Accommodations on the Assessment of LEP Students in NAEP	Arnold Goldstein
Literacy of adults		
98–17	Developing the National Assessment of Adult Literacy: Recommendations from Stakeholders	Sheida White
1999–09a	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: An Overview	Alex Sedlacek
1999–09b	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Sample Design	Alex Sedlacek
1999–09c	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Weighting and Population Estimates	Alex Sedlacek
1999–09d	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Development of the Survey Instruments	Alex Sedlacek
1999–09e	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Scaling and Proficiency Estimates	Alex Sedlacek
1999–09f	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Interpreting the Adult Literacy Scales and Literacy Levels	Alex Sedlacek
1999–09g	1992 National Adult Literacy Survey: Literacy Levels and the Response Probability Convention	Alex Sedlacek
1999–11	Data Sources on Lifelong Learning Available from the National Center for Education Statistics	Lisa Hudson
2000–05	Secondary Statistical Modeling With the National Assessment of Adult Literacy: Implications for the Design of the Background Questionnaire	Sheida White
2000–06	Using Telephone and Mail Surveys as a Supplement or Alternative to Door-to-Door Surveys in the Assessment of Adult Literacy	Sheida White
2000–07	"How Much Literacy is Enough?" Issues in Defining and Reporting Performance Standards for the National Assessment of Adult Literacy	Sheida White
2000–08	Evaluation of the 1992 NALS Background Survey Questionnaire: An Analysis of Uses with Recommendations for Revisions	Sheida White
2000–09	Demographic Changes and Literacy Development in a Decade	Sheida White
2001–08	Assessing the Lexile Framework: Results of a Panel Meeting	Sheida White
Literacy of adults – international		
97–33	Adult Literacy: An International Perspective	Marilyn Binkley
Mathematics		
98–09	High School Curriculum Structure: Effects on Coursetaking and Achievement in Mathematics for High School Graduates—An Examination of Data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988	Jeffrey Owings
1999–08	Measuring Classroom Instructional Processes: Using Survey and Case Study Field Test Results to Improve Item Construction	Dan Kasprzyk
2001–05	Using TIMSS to Analyze Correlates of Performance Variation in Mathematics	Patrick Gonzales

No.	Title	NCES contact
2001–07	A Comparison of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the Third International Mathematics and Science Study Repeat (TIMSS-R), and the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)	Arnold Goldstein
2001–11	Impact of Selected Background Variables on Students' NAEP Math Performance	Arnold Goldstein
Parental involvement in education		
96–03	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88) Research Framework and Issues	Jeffrey Owings
97–25	1996 National Household Education Survey (NHES:96) Questionnaires: Screener/Household and Library, Parent and Family Involvement in Education and Civic Involvement, Youth Civic Involvement, and Adult Civic Involvement	Kathryn Chandler
1999–01	A Birth Cohort Study: Conceptual and Design Considerations and Rationale	Jerry West
2001–06	Papers from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Studies Program: Presented at the 2001 AERA and SRCD Meetings	Jerry West
2001–19	The Measurement of Home Background Indicators: Cognitive Laboratory Investigations of the Responses of Fourth and Eighth Graders to Questionnaire Items and Parental Assessment of the Invasiveness of These Items	Arnold Goldstein
Participation rates		
98–10	Adult Education Participation Decisions and Barriers: Review of Conceptual Frameworks and Empirical Studies	Peter Stowe
Postsecondary education		
1999–11	Data Sources on Lifelong Learning Available from the National Center for Education Statistics	Lisa Hudson
2000–16a	Lifelong Learning NCES Task Force: Final Report Volume I	Lisa Hudson
2000–16b	Lifelong Learning NCES Task Force: Final Report Volume II	Lisa Hudson
Postsecondary education – persistence and attainment		
98–11	Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study First Follow-up (BPS:96–98) Field Test Report	Aurora D'Amico
1999–15	Projected Postsecondary Outcomes of 1992 High School Graduates	Aurora D'Amico
Postsecondary education – staff		
97–26	Strategies for Improving Accuracy of Postsecondary Faculty Lists	Linda Zimbler
2000–01	1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99) Field Test Report	Linda Zimbler
Principals		
2000–10	A Research Agenda for the 1999–2000 Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
Private schools		
96–16	Strategies for Collecting Finance Data from Private Schools	Stephen Broughman
97–07	The Determinants of Per-Pupil Expenditures in Private Elementary and Secondary Schools: An Exploratory Analysis	Stephen Broughman
97–22	Collection of Private School Finance Data: Development of a Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
2000–13	Non-professional Staff in the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and Common Core of Data (CCD)	Kerry Gruber
2000–15	Feasibility Report: School-Level Finance Pretest, Private School Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
Projections of education statistics		
1999–15	Projected Postsecondary Outcomes of 1992 High School Graduates	Aurora D'Amico
Public school finance		
1999–16	Measuring Resources in Education: From Accounting to the Resource Cost Model Approach	William J. Fowler, Jr.
2000–18	Feasibility Report: School-Level Finance Pretest, Public School District Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
Public schools		
97–43	Measuring Inflation in Public School Costs	William J. Fowler, Jr.

No.	Title	NCES contact
98–01	Collection of Public School Expenditure Data: Development of a Questionnaire	Stephen Broughman
98–04	Geographic Variations in Public Schools' Costs	William J. Fowler, Jr.
1999–02	Tracking Secondary Use of the Schools and Staffing Survey Data: Preliminary Results	Dan Kasprzyk
2000–12	Coverage Evaluation of the 1994–95 Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey	Beth Young
2000–13	Non-professional Staff in the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and Common Core of Data (CCD)	Kerry Gruber
2002–02	Locale Codes 1987 - 2000	Frank Johnson
Public schools – secondary		
98–09	High School Curriculum Structure: Effects on Coursetaking and Achievement in Mathematics for High School Graduates—An Examination of Data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988	Jeffrey Owings
Reform, educational		
96–03	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88) Research Framework and Issues	Jeffrey Owings
Response rates		
98–02	Response Variance in the 1993–94 Schools and Staffing Survey: A Reinterview Report	Steven Kaufman
School districts		
2000–10	A Research Agenda for the 1999–2000 Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
School districts, public		
98–07	Decennial Census School District Project Planning Report	Tai Phan
1999–03	Evaluation of the 1996–97 Nonfiscal Common Core of Data Surveys Data Collection, Processing, and Editing Cycle	Beth Young
School districts, public – demographics of		
96–04	Census Mapping Project/School District Data Book	Tai Phan
Schools		
97–42	Improving the Measurement of Staffing Resources at the School Level: The Development of Recommendations for NCES for the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS)	Mary Rollefson
98–08	The Redesign of the Schools and Staffing Survey for 1999–2000: A Position Paper	Dan Kasprzyk
1999–03	Evaluation of the 1996–97 Nonfiscal Common Core of Data Surveys Data Collection, Processing, and Editing Cycle	Beth Young
2000–10	A Research Agenda for the 1999–2000 Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
2002-02	Locale Codes 1987 - 2000	Frank Johnson
Schools – safety and discipline		
97–09	Status of Data on Crime and Violence in Schools: Final Report	Lee Hoffman
Science		
2000–11	Financial Aid Profile of Graduate Students in Science and Engineering	Aurora D'Amico
2001–07	A Comparison of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the Third International Mathematics and Science Study Repeat (TIMSS-R), and the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)	Arnold Goldstein
Software evaluation		
2000–03	Strengths and Limitations of Using SUDAAN, Stata, and WesVarPC for Computing Variances from NCES Data Sets	Ralph Lee
Staff		
97–42	Improving the Measurement of Staffing Resources at the School Level: The Development of Recommendations for NCES for the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS)	Mary Rollefson
98–08	The Redesign of the Schools and Staffing Survey for 1999–2000: A Position Paper	Dan Kasprzyk

No.	Title	NCES contact
Staff – higher education institutions		
97–26	Strategies for Improving Accuracy of Postsecondary Faculty Lists	Linda Zimbler
Staff – nonprofessional		
2000–13	Non-professional Staff in the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) and Common Core of Data (CCD)	Kerry Gruber
State		
1999–03	Evaluation of the 1996–97 Nonfiscal Common Core of Data Surveys Data Collection, Processing, and Editing Cycle	Beth Young
Statistical methodology		
97–21	Statistics for Policymakers or Everything You Wanted to Know About Statistics But Thought You Could Never Understand	Susan Ahmed
Statistical standards and methodology		
2001–05	Using TIMSS to Analyze Correlates of Performance Variation in Mathematics	Patrick Gonzales
Students with disabilities		
95–13	Assessing Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficiency	James Houser
2001–13	The Effects of Accommodations on the Assessment of LEP Students in NAEP	Arnold Goldstein
Survey methodology		
96–17	National Postsecondary Student Aid Study: 1996 Field Test Methodology Report	Andrew G. Malizio
97–15	Customer Service Survey: Common Core of Data Coordinators	Lee Hoffman
97–35	Design, Data Collection, Interview Administration Time, and Data Editing in the 1996 National Household Education Survey	Kathryn Chandler
98–06	National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88) Base Year through Second Follow-Up: Final Methodology Report	Ralph Lee
98–11	Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study First Follow-up (BPS:96–98) Field Test Report	Aurora D'Amico
98–16	A Feasibility Study of Longitudinal Design for Schools and Staffing Survey	Stephen Broughman
1999–07	Collection of Resource and Expenditure Data on the Schools and Staffing Survey	Stephen Broughman
1999–17	Secondary Use of the Schools and Staffing Survey Data	Susan Wiley
2000–01	1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:99) Field Test Report	Linda Zimbler
2000–02	Coordinating NCES Surveys: Options, Issues, Challenges, and Next Steps	Valena Plisko
2000–04	Selected Papers on Education Surveys: Papers Presented at the 1998 and 1999 ASA and 1999 AAPOR Meetings	Dan Kasprzyk
2000–12	Coverage Evaluation of the 1994–95 Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe Survey	Beth Young
2000–17	National Postsecondary Student Aid Study:2000 Field Test Methodology Report	Andrew G. Malizio
2001–04	Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study: 1996–2001 (BPS:1996/2001) Field Test Methodology Report	Paula Knepper
2001–07	A Comparison of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the Third International Mathematics and Science Study Repeat (TIMSS-R), and the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)	Arnold Goldstein
2001–09	An Assessment of the Accuracy of CCD Data: A Comparison of 1988, 1989, and 1990 CCD Data with 1990–91 SASS Data	John Sietsema
2001–11	Impact of Selected Background Variables on Students' NAEP Math Performance	Arnold Goldstein
2001–13	The Effects of Accommodations on the Assessment of LEP Students in NAEP	Arnold Goldstein
2001–19	The Measurement of Home Background Indicators: Cognitive Laboratory Investigations of the Responses of Fourth and Eighth Graders to Questionnaire Items and Parental Assessment of the Invasiveness of These Items	Arnold Goldstein
2002-01	Legal and Ethical Issues in the Use of Video in Education Research	Patrick Gonzales
2002-02	Locale Codes 1987 - 2000	Frank Johnson
Teachers		
98–13	Response Variance in the 1994–95 Teacher Follow-up Survey	Steven Kaufman

No.	Title	NCES contact
1999–14	1994–95 Teacher Followup Survey: Data File User's Manual, Restricted-Use Codebook	Kerry Gruber
2000–10	A Research Agenda for the 1999–2000 Schools and Staffing Survey	Dan Kasprzyk
Teachers – instructional practices of		
98–08	The Redesign of the Schools and Staffing Survey for 1999–2000: A Position Paper	Dan Kasprzyk
Teachers – opinions regarding safety		
98–08	The Redesign of the Schools and Staffing Survey for 1999–2000: A Position Paper	Dan Kasprzyk
Teachers – performance evaluations		
1999–04	Measuring Teacher Qualifications	Dan Kasprzyk
Teachers – qualifications of		
1999–04	Measuring Teacher Qualifications	Dan Kasprzyk
Teachers – salaries of		
94–05	Cost-of-Education Differentials Across the States	William J. Fowler, Jr.
Training		
2000–16a	Lifelong Learning NCES Task Force: Final Report Volume I	Lisa Hudson
2000–16b	Lifelong Learning NCES Task Force: Final Report Volume II	Lisa Hudson
Variance estimation		
2000–03	Strengths and Limitations of Using SUDAAN, Stata, and WesVarPC for Computing Variances from NCES Data Sets	Ralph Lee
2000–04	Selected Papers on Education Surveys: Papers Presented at the 1998 and 1999 ASA and 1999 AAPOR Meetings	Dan Kasprzyk
2001–18	A Study of Variance Estimation Methods	Ralph Lee
Violence		
97–09	Status of Data on Crime and Violence in Schools: Final Report	Lee Hoffman
Vocational education		
95–12	Rural Education Data User's Guide	Samuel Peng
1999–05	Procedures Guide for Transcript Studies	Dawn Nelson
1999–06	1998 Revision of the Secondary School Taxonomy	Dawn Nelson

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
X	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").